

REMARKS

Applicant's counsel thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration given the application. The claims have been amended and new claims have been added. Support for the changes in the claims is as follows. Claim 17- page 5 lines 21-23; claim 41-page 5 lines 26-27; claim 42- page 5 lines 28-30; claims 43-45- pending claim 17. No new matter has been added.

Pending claim 21 has been rejected in view of US 5578370 (Ferrar). This claim specified that the tape, film or yarn is in the form of a woven or non-woven cloth. This rejection may have been made because the combination of the tape that is reinforced in Ferrar and the tape that is used to reinforce the other tape together may form a mat. However, it is not disclosed to apply a tape in the form of woven or non-woven cloth to the tape that is reinforced. Accordingly, this feature in amended claim 17 defines the present claims over Ferrar. The product claims are novel for the same reason.

Applying the tape, film or yarn in the form of a cloth provides improved reinforcement. Reinforcing the article with the cloth as defined in present claim 17 is in particular advantageous in that fragmentation of the article is suppressed when it is subjected to a high impact (as set forth in the specification, page 6, first paragraph). When the tapes, films or yarns are welded together, the cloth-form provides a composite material of very high structural integrity (as set forth in the specification at page 11, lines 5-10).

Applicant further observes that the handling of this kind of cloth is simple. The cloth is coherent, light and flexible. Applicant further found that the cloth also works well even if it is not perfectly positioned into a mold because the cloth lets itself be re-adjusted into the final shape. It does not disturb or barely disturbs the extrusion or molding process.

Regarding claim 41, the Examiner's attention is drawn to the fact that compacting the cloth offers an additional advantage, namely an improved stiffness, and not only in the direction of the material (as set forth in the specification at page 5, final paragraph).

Regarding claim 45, the feature of heat and/or pressure treatment is in particular useful in combination with the use of the cloth and the tape, film or yarn being of the AB or ABA type, as thus that tapes, films or yarns forming the cloth can be welded together, thereby further

contributing to the reinforcement (as set forth in the specification, page 8, paragraph at line 11). When the tapes, films or yarns are welded together (as a result of the heat/pressure treatment), the cloth-form provides a composite material of very high structural integrity (as set forth in the specification at page 11, lines 5-10; and at page 14, final paragraph).

Regarding the double patenting rejection of claim 30, it is noted that the article of claim 29 is a subcombination of the combination of claim 30. Accordingly, claim 30 is much broader than claim 29 and therefore a double patenting rejection of claim 30 is not appropriate.

In view of all the foregoing, it is clear that the claims as now presented define methods and products which are superior to, and clearly not obvious in view of, the prior art. For all these reasons, claim 17 as now presented clearly defines over the prior art of record; all other claims are dependent claims and are accordingly allowable by reason of their dependency. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If any further fees are required by this communication, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. VOB-38027.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By 
John P. Murtaugh, Reg. No. 34226

1801 East 9th Street, Suite 1200
Cleveland, OH 44114-3108
Phone: 216-579-1700

Date: August 23, 2010